



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

they may be regarded as the subject-matter of the contract and its breach is a direct injury to them occasioning the real damage which is the gist of the recovery, *Chapman v. Western U. T. Co.*, 90 Ky. 265, 13 S. W. 888. But the cases extending the recovery thus far expressly refuse to go farther and allow a recovery for physical pain and suffering, apparently on the theory that it is not a consequence of the breach which furnishes the cause of action sued on, but is a result which would have occurred whether there had been a breach or not. *Giese v. Schultz*, 53 Wis. 462, 10 N. W. 598, 65 Wis. 487, 27 N. W. 353, 69 Wis. 521, 34 N. W. 913; *Dalrymple v. Green*, 88 Kan. 673, 129 Pac. 1145; *Musselman v. Barker*, 26 Neb. 737, 42 N. W. 759; *Schmidt v. Durnham*, 46 Minn. 227; *Salchert v. Reinig*, 135 Wis. 194; *Haymond v. Saucer*, 84 Ind. 3; *Osmun v. Winters*, 25 Or. 260, 35 Pac. 250; also see *Wrynn v. Downey*, *supra*, and case note 4 L. R. A. (N. S.) 616. In only one other case that has been found, has an instruction as broad as that in the principal case been approved. In *Wilds v. Bogan*, 57 Ind. 453, an instruction, on the measure of damages, was upheld which stated to the jury that if plaintiff had been seduced by the defendant under a promise of marriage and had given birth to his bastard child, they might, in assessing damages, take into consideration the plaintiff's feelings, pain and humiliation, in giving birth to such a child. But in the later case of *Haymond v. Saucer*, 84 Ind. 3, a different rule was laid down by the same court without comment on the previous case.

DIVORCE—HUSBAND'S LIABILITY FOR SUPPORT OF HIS MINOR CHILDREN AFTER DIVORCE.—A husband obtained a divorce from his wife on the ground of desertion, she being defaulted after service by publication. Neither the bill nor the decree made any reference to the child of the parties; the wife now seeks to recover sums expended in supporting the child, which has remained in her custody, and to obtain an order requiring the defendant to pay a certain sum monthly for its support. *Held*, that he is liable. *Schoenmauer v. Schoenmauer* (Wash. 1914), 137 Pac. 325.

The court overruled defendant's contention that, since the decree was granted because of the wife's fault, therefore she could not recover, declaring that defendant's liability for the support of the child had not been previously determined, and that such liability would remain even though the wife had been remiss. This defense was allowed in *Fittler v. Fittler*, 33 Pa. 50; *Fulton v. Fulton*, 52 Ohio 229, 49 Am. St. Rep. 720, 29 L. R. A. 678. See also *Foss v. Hartwell*, 168 Mass. 66, 37 L. R. A. 589; *Baldwin v. Foster*, 138 Mass. 449; *Glynn v. Glynn*, 94 Me. 465; *Lapworth v. Leach*, 79 Mich. 16; 12 MICH. L. REV. 149. It would seem that children should not be deprived of their right to support by their father, because of their mother's wrongdoing, and in accord with the principal case are *White v. White*, 169 Mo. App. 40, 154 S. W. 872; *Bemus v. Bemus* (Tex. Civ. App.), 133 S. W. 503. For a recent general discussion of the liability of the father to support his minor children see *Johnson v. Latty* (1914 N. D. Ohio), 210 Fed. 961, which affirms his liability.